

# **DEMOCRATS OF FRANCE!**

**AN AMERICAN APPEAL BY**

**FERDINAND HANSEN**

---

**WITH A SUPPLEMENT:**

## **THE TRUE FACE OF FRANCE**

**HISTORICAL MATERIAL**

**EDITED AND TRANSLATED BY**

**THEODOR J. RITTER**



# REAL PEACE!

**Revise the Treaty of Versailles!  
Let us have a Real Peace!**

BY

**AN ENTENTE DIPLOMATIST**

*(L. Graham Scott, Esq. Nephew of the Duke of Buccleugh)*



*„Mr. Graham Scott's brochure is such an excellent abstract of many of the underlying causes of the war, and his attitude towards the policy of his own country such a fine example of English fearlessness and frankness at its best, that the little pamphlet should be in the hands of everyone — not only in his own land“*

# Democrats of France!

An American Appeal by

Ferdinand Hansen



O v e r s e a s P u b l i s h i n g C o .  
H a m b u r g 15

NEWSPAPERS PLEASE COPY!

## *Democrats of France!*

In a speech delivered at the Lotus Club, New York in November 1921, your former Prime Minister Mr. Briand suggested to us Americans of German descent that we play the part of mediators between France and Germany and influence our kinsmen in Germany to live up to the terms of the TREATY OF VERSAILLES. At the same time, he dramatically assured his hearers of the absolutely peaceful intentions of France! — an assurance that has been echoed repeatedly by Mr. Briand's successor in office.

The peaceful intentions of France! Is it possible that you yourselves believe in these pious protestations — that you do not see the real intentions of your leaders and their financial backers before and after the war? Then let me try to disillusion you!

It was in the spring of 1916. I was in Europe on my annual business trip. When I started out with my family to return to my home in New York, circumstances prevented the trip and I was forced to stay in Germany. — It was a terrible experience, this living in a country where thousands of children perished because there was no milk anywhere, where sad-eyed emaciated mothers haunted the garbage-pails in the streets to find a bit of food for their children. The vision of the sad and pinched little faces and of the wild look in the mothers' eyes has burnt itself into my memory for ever. Thanks to the willpower of my wife, a courageous daughter of the once glorious French Republic, our own little children escaped the hunger diseases that were wasting away the lives of our fellowmen about us, even long after the actual war was over. It will always remain a miracle to me how these starved Germans were able to preserve their moral and physical power of resistance up to the time when their childlike faith in the assurances of our

President Woodrow Wilson caused them to lay down their arms.

Our great American Democracy espoused the cause of France in order to destroy militarism to make the world safe for democracy and to protect justice, liberty and civilisation! Providence gave the United States a unique opportunity to make the end of this murderous war a permanent blessing for the whole of mankind. Alas — that our leaders let this opportunity slip from their hands!

The supreme militaristic power has now been passed to France — power of arms such as has never been known before. What will France do with this power? Her threat has been that she will use it “to sweep victoriously over the whole of Europe”, if Germany fails to fulfil the impossible terms of the Treaty of Versailles, terms which your leaders insisted upon in order to achieve the disruption of the German nation and the gradual destruction of a large part of the race. “There are 20 millions more Germans than there ought to be — we are doing a good piece of work, if we help killing them off.” — This is about the way that Clemenceau puts it. Bankrupt Russia and completely exhausted Germany are to pour an endless stream of gold into France, according to what your leaders and their servile and corrupt press keep on telling you!!

What do your Clemenceaus, Poincarés and all the other chauvinistic fomenters of the war spirit care for the common people? They have had their “Revanche!” and are itching for more power and glory. That they have brought unspeakable suffering to millions of French families, let alone other nations, is nothing to them. Or do they do all their strutting and barking merely to draw the attention of watchful eyes away from the muffled figure at their back!? Truth is there waiting that her light be allowed once more to shine on a world darkened by the thick webs of calumny, hypocrisy and greed. Democratic Frenchmen — do your share! Fellow Christians help reveal! You know that Germany long ago offered to throw open her Archives in order to prove conclusively that she is not the guilty

provoker of the war and that the Treaty of Versailles being based on this deliberate falsehood of your leaders is thereby invalidated. It is your duty, democrats of France, to force your imperialistic leaders to let the world have the truth. The admission of guilt which was forced from the Germans at Versailles, because the latter were afraid of bolshevism at home, has never satisfied the conscience of the world. Even your allies are beginning to look at you with increasing suspicion. Poincaré is reported to have recently stated in private: "Nothing more dangerous could happen to France, than to shake the belief of the French people in Germany's sole responsibility for the war!"

I have suffered with the German civil population and I feel it to be my duty as an American citizen to reply to Mr. Briand's cool appeal. Some of my German friends have collected authentic material chiefly from French, American, English and RUSSIAN sources in order to lay bare the real intentions of your leaders and to show what the inevitable result would be if these intentions should actually be carried out.

Study the facts, please, with Mr. Briand's suggestion in mind "that the German Americans urge the German people to fulfill the terms of the Versailles Treaty" and you will agree with the millions of Americans of German blood in condemning the cynicism of that suggestion.

Ferdinand Hansen.

---





# The true Face of France!

Historical Material

Edited and translated by

Theodor J. Ritter



O v e r s e a s P u b l i s h i n g C o .  
H a m b u r g 15

## *Contents*

	Page
The Question of Responsibility . . . . .	3
English Opinions	
French Opinions	
France and the Eisner Trial	
New Russian Documents	
The Treaty of Versailles . . . . .	15
Different points of view	
The Question of Reparations	
“Noble and Peace-Loving France” in the Light of German History . . . . .	23
Traditional French aims	
French invasions of Germany	
The Question of Elsass-Lothringen	
French Militarism . . . . .	30
The colored troops	
The Rhineland as a French military base	
France and the Saar-District	
France, Poland and Upper Silesia	
Crippled Germany	
France and the restoration of Europe	

---

### *The Question of Responsibility.*

Our boasted civilisation seems to be doomed unless it cleanses and purges itself, choked, as it is, with the poison of insincerity and dishonesty.

During decades before the war, the common people of certain enemy countries were being subjected to a mental treatment aimed at creating in their minds a latent hostility against Germany. The honest and clean German governmental system, antiquated and out of touch with the spirit of the times, as no doubt it was in a great many ways, was made to appear as "a sinister force for evil demanding most careful watching". By the time the war broke out, these foreign nations had thus unconsciously developed a strong prejudice against Germany. This was revealed at once by the fact that, for instance, a vast majority of the American people failed to realise that their neutral country was being subjected to a highpressure of anti-German propaganda. A whole flood of lies and calumny was let loose at Paris and London and the prejudice having been carefully nursed during decades blossomed forth into the strangest phenomena, one of them being that these nations seemed to be ready to believe the Germans capable of anything despicable. They accepted the most senseless atrocity yarns, a mess of filth concocted by crooks like the much feted 'John Bull' Horatio Bottomley (recently sentenced to 7 years of hard labor for larceny) or the Reverend Newell Dwight Hillis of Plymouth Church, New York, a confessed defaulter who harangued his congregations telling wild lies about German bestiality and infamy.

During the war the average man or woman found it impossible to base opinions on personal study of facts. They

were naturally forced to depend upon the honesty and truthfulness of those among them who seemed to be officially recognized as honorable patriots and who made it their business to inform the people of the real facts.

In France several generations of men had been raised in hatred of Germany and fervently believed that their country had suffered "a terrible wrong" in 1870/71. There can be no doubt that, with French leaders wanting "REVANCHE", this hatred made France the agent provocateur who caused the war.

The war is over. "Revanche" has been obtained. Untold millions have perished to make it possible . . . "The terrible wrong" has been righted and with this most disappointing result that her beloved "lost province" will have nothing to do with France and clamors for autonomy!!

The war is over? Theoretically yes! Germany is disarmed and her "terrible governmental system" which had served many of the 27 nations joining the fight as a war pretext, exists no longer, Germany now having the freest constitution of all republics. The enemies of the old German Empire, however, are evidently also the enemies of the German Republic and they are doing everything to crush the new freedom. The same old lies of German guilt and German "Schrecklichkeit" are being fed by their press, in their schools and from the pulpit to the common people of enemy countries.

Can it be possible that the hidden moulders of Public Opinion are correct in their estimate of the gullibility of the common people? It almost seems so; they are certainly leading them by the nose and are making them partners to every crime which it suits them to commit in order to attain their ends. One of the lies was that Germany was threatening the sovereign rights of other nations. Germany, of course, never did anything of the kind, for her only desire was to be let alone, to live and to prosper. A great debt of gratitude we Germans therefore owe the much abused Bolsheviks for giving to the world the secret documents of the Tsarist government, a new collection of which is

just being published. These documents must indeed be embarrassing especially to France, because they dispose, once for all, of the legends which the responsible leaders of enemy countries told their people about a "wicked, god-forsaken Germany", "a faultless, noble and peace-loving France" and so on. The German government also is beginning to publish all its diplomatic documents from 1870 to 1914 in proof of the fact that never, at any time, during these 44 years, did Germany have any other desire but to preserve the Peace. On the other hand the Russian Tsarist documents leave no doubt as to the identity of the conspirators who plunged the world into war in 1914.

The Versailles Treaty being based on Germany's sole guilt is therefore invalidated before the bar of Justice and Truth.

That Poincaré was the driving force in the conspiracy which coolly planned the destruction of Germany on a Mutual Benefit Basis is more or less revealed by the documents that have thus far come to light.

The common people were made to believe that they were fighting for a holy cause, for the protection of civilization itself!! A certain grim humor attaches to the fact that it is Tsaristic Russia, the faithful ally and brother in the fight for human rights, who raises her voice from the grave, as it were, to let the world know the truth.

I address myself to the common sense of the average citizens of all enemy countries. It is up to them to declare whether, knowing the Truth, they will still uphold the leaders who, to speak with Per Hallström, Sweden's greatest living poet: "have brought this shame upon Europe, and who have committed a horrible crime that cannot be forgotten nor atoned".

---

**English  
Opinions.**

The London "Nation and Athenaeum" says in its issue of April 1922:

"Having arrogated the right to judge and the right to punish, the conquering Powers never had any difficulty in proving their enemy's lonely and supereminent wickedness. Among the nations of the world, they said, Germany stood out as the most barbarous, the most acquisitive and the most military Power. Now, none of these charges was true. Imperial Russia was by far the most barbarous of the "Entente" Empires. We (for good or evil) were the most acquisitive, and France, as her afterwar career has shown, was the most military . . . . . But it is a fact of the closest relevance to the evil which the Treaty of Versailles has let loose on society, that its moral basis, which was Germany's sole responsibility for the war was a falsehood which later testimony has torn to tatters."

H. W. Massingham writes in "Public Affairs" of June 1922 as follows:

"If Germany did not alone dig the pit into which she and the rest of the world fell, then the Treaty of Versailles is a lie, its scheme of annexations and confiscations breaks down and incidentally we are in a state of mortal sin against a neighbour.

Now the thesis on which the fable of the sole war guilt of Germany was built up, was virtually as follows: Germany having planned the World War of 1914, organized the diplomacy of July and August in such fashion as to bring it about. On no other supposition could she be called a perfectly guilty power, deserving all the loss and the suffering that her victors have imposed upon her. But in order to make that view a plausible one, it is necessary to exhibit Germany in the guise of the controlling force in Europe, and in particular as the mistress of the situation of

Serajewo. It is precisely this structure which has broken down and which no fairminded or well informed person will ever attempt to restore. So far from the Germany of July 1914 being in control of the crisis that followed the murder of the Archduke, she was in a large measure its victim.

Now let me recur to the argument of criminality. It presupposes the organisation of an immensely superior force on the part of Austria-Germany. No such superiority existed. The available French army, according to a French general, was larger at the outbreak of the war than the German one. The new Russian army, the result of French money and military suggestion, was overwhelmingly larger. Italy had left the Central Alliance and Germany knew that one decisive military advantage, that of rapidity and skill of organisation, remained to her, for with England hostile she ran an imminent risk of starvation in a prolonged war. Nevertheless she did not in this Russian war act with precipitation. The precipitation was Russia's. It is known that the Russian General Mobilisation (i. e. against Germany and Austria) was rushed through by the fraud which Sukhomlinow and Janushkevich practised on the Tsar. The Tsar assented to partial mobilisation only. In face of his veto these criminals prepared a general mobilisation, lying to England and declaring that "partial" mobilisation was alone contemplated. For this "partial" action Austria's (i. e. Berchtold's) refusal of direct negotiations was largely responsible. But general mobilisation, made in the hour when Germany was still a mediator, was an entirely different affair. It brought about a corresponding German mobilisation and if that was gross error of impatience, it was the consequence and not the cause of the capital crime of Russia. What then remains of the theory of sole guilt on Germany's part?"

The Paris Peace Makers played the part of Public Prosecutor and of Judge at the same time. Poincaré, stated

in January 1919: "Careful investigations as to the cause of the crime which excited the world, are not necessary"! As far as they themselves were concerned, the Paris Peace Makers declared to be entirely innocent.

Mr. E. D. Morel said in a speech delivered at a great Labor demonstration at the Caird Hall, Dundee in May 1922:

" . . . . But mark this. In the very act of affixing their signatures to that "Charter of Wrongs", Lloyd George and Clemenceau sowed the seeds of the discord which now threatens a rupture between their two countries. — — — — The British imperialists wished to destroy Germany as a trade rival overseas and as a colonial power. The French imperialists had no objection, provided they were left free to destroy Germany in Europe. It was here that the future conflict became inevitable. For it was not, and it is not, a British interest that Germany be destroyed. . . . .

But the wider problem has still to be faced — the problem of the Versailles Treaty. The Versailles Treaty is the real problem of Europe. Essentially it is neither a political nor an economic problem. Its authors sinned against the light. While that engine of oppression which America refused to work is acknowledged as the public law of Europe, there will be no peace, there will be no disarmament, there will be no rebirth of British industry. There will be a steady sinking deeper and deeper into the morass until exasperated and tortured humanity breaks out again into bloody strife. This fatal instrument of folly must disappear, together with the legend upon which its authors have sought to justify it. The attempt to make the German People pay in this generation and the next for the sins of all the other rulers and nations of Europe, has had the effect, as it was bound to have, as some of us told you from the beginning it would have, of fastening a millstone round the necks of our people and of all the peoples of Europe. The Versailles Treaty is a cancer eating into the vitals of Europe. We are rapidly



reaching, perhaps we have reached, the supreme crisis of our age and generation. The issue goes very deep; right down to the roots of our boasted civilisation and of the religion we profess. Our spiritual bearings are out of gear."

When Poincaré was appointed minister of Foreign Affairs in 1912, Jaurés prophesied: "Poincaré, well that means war!" (Reuillard, *Les rapports-allemands*, Paris 1921.)

**French  
Opinions.**

Ernest Renault, formerly editor in chief of the "Soleil" remarks in his work: "1914—15, *Histoire populaire de la guerre*" with regard to Poincaré's visit to St. Petersburg in 1912:

"Your and Sasonoffs Balkan policy was decisive for the development which led to the world war in 1914. In spite of the Balkan war for which you, Monsieur Poincaré, were as much responsible as Russia, because you supported her policy, the Peace of Europe was preserved exclusively because the Central Powers refused to be drawn into war."

About that time the Russian Ambassador in London (see Siebert Diplomatic documents) reported that "of all Powers France is the only one which wishes the war". In Iswolsky's report to the Russian government on January 30th 1913, we read: "The French government is aware that the final result of the present Balkan complications will necessitate France's entry in the general war and she coolly expects it." To successfully prepare Public Opinion in France, Poincaré demanded of Russia "closest cooperation"! Immediately after the assassination of the Austrian Arch-Duke, Poincaré went to Russia on a diplomatic visit in June 1914!! Renault calls this "an imprudence bordering on insanity".

On February 15th 1920, the Paris "Humanité" asked why in searching for the guilty parties, Poincaré should not be placed on the list of the guilty ones, for in the "OPINION" of December 14th 1918, he had claimed the

honor to have brought on the war by his policy. Gouthenoire de Toury in his book: "Poincaré a-t-il voulu la guerre?" arrives also at an affirmative answer.

***France and  
the Eisner  
Trial.***

The war did come and the German people during 4 long years defended themselves bravely against the strangely assorted champions of Justice, Liberty, Democracy and Civilisation until hunger and Wilson's 14 points caused them to lay down their arms. The immediate result was that the political system of Germany completely collapsed and that the Social-Democrats and radical elements which partly inclined towards bolshevism obtained the upper hand. In Bavaria the communist and idealist (?) Kurt Eisner was appointed Prime minister. He did incalculable damage to the German cause by forging important official documents. One of them, a report of von Schoen's of July 18th 1914, deals with the localising of the Austro-Serbian conflict and Eisner's forged copy of it gives the impartial or antagonistic reader the impression that Germany and Austria had arranged a procedure against Serbia that must lead to a general European war. Clemenceau had good use for these forgeries and immediately employed them to induce Lloyd George and Wilson to drop the latter's "14 points" of which Lansing declared that they had not even been mentioned at the Peace Conference. And Eisner had hoped his forgeries would secure milder terms for the young German republic!!

At the recent Munich trial, Eisner's private secretary Fechenbach declared thru his lawyer Dr. Loewenfeld: "I should denounce Eisner as a scoundrel if he would not admit today that, in view of the material that has come to light since his death, his assertions as to the responsibility of Germany for the outbreak of the world war were not based on facts!"

The librarian of the former Prussian Herrenhaus,

Dr. Friedrich Thimme, one of the experts\*) testifying at the trial, declared on his oath that the minutest study of the vast number of German Official Documents during the entire period from 1870 to 1914 (of which 6 volumes have thus far been issued in book form), did not reveal a shred of justification to speak of a will to war on the part of official Germany during all this time! But on the contrary it revealed an ever present and all pervading desire to preserve peace.

The testimony of Count Soden and of Dr. Thimme proved very interesting.

Count Soden, at that time secretary of the Bavarian Embassy at Berlin, was informed by Kurt Eisner on Nov. 24th 1918 that he Eisner, kept in constant touch with Clemenceau and that Clemenceau had sent him a message urging relentless exposure of the old German regime with regard to the sole responsibility for the war, such as had been accomplished by the publication of the von Schoen document and which would be the *conditio sine qua non* for a true reconciliation of the nations. Eisner furthermore told him that Clemenceau, Lloyd George and Wilson were all three of them "the greatest idealists who did not dream of destroying the German people". Apparently the enemy had correctly gauged the mentality of leaders like Eisner in using him and others like him as tools in their incessant attempts "to break down the German home front" and later, when this had at last been accomplished to destroy the economic structure of Germany because these men rose to power on the forced admission of Germany's "sole guilt for the war".

It is, of course, preposterous to assume that these forgeries had a determining effect on the "French Tiger" and his fellow

---

\*) Among the Foreign experts who attended the trial were:

Professor Sidney B. Fay, Northampton, Mass

Professor Thomas C. Hall of New Jersey

E. N. Bennet, member of Parliament, London

Joseph King of the English Labor party, London

Edouard Dujardin, Professor of History, Paris

J. Versluys, Hilversum, Holland

Peace-Makers, but the former lost no time to publish them as proofs of a self confessed, guilty Germany. Public Opinion of the Allied countries naturally accepted them at their face value.

***New Russian Documents<sup>1)</sup>***

The Bolsheviks may be criticized from various points of view, but I fancy history will give them its unqualified gratitude for their opening of the Tsarist archives of Russia. Immediately after the revolution had assumed its Soviet form in November, 1917, the new Government of the Republic began to publish the secret treaties, which revealed so thoroughly the imperialist character of the Russian official war "for right, justice, and liberty," the Tsarist struggle "against Prussian militarism". The secret treaties were followed by various other scattered publications, often of high importance. Now M. René Marchand has brought to light a mass of the correspondence of Isvolsky (Januar 1, 1911 — December 18, 1912<sup>2)</sup>). These despatches, telegrams, and letters form a series of documents of the first order of value, and show how vigorously, intelligently, and unscrupulously this guardian of the Peace of Europe worked as Russian Ambassador in Paris to complete the chief task of his later life, the grinding and sharpening of the Triple Entente. Scarcely any of this material has hitherto appeared; a few fragments only have been printed in the Russian "Izvestya" and "Pravda", in the German White Book of 1919, and in the "Diplomatische Aktenstücke" of von Siebert<sup>3)</sup>). Along with the Isvolsky matter here supplied, we are furnished with three most interesting reports of M. Nekludov, Councillor of the Russian Embassy in Paris, and afterwards Russian Minister in Bulgaria and in Sweden, and Ambassador in Spain, on the home and foreign policy of France at the end of 1919.

<sup>1)</sup> „Public Affairs“, June 1922.

<sup>2)</sup> Un Livre Noir: Diplomatie d'avant-guerre d'après les Documents des Archives Russes. Tome Premier. (Librairie du Travail, Paris.)

<sup>3)</sup> Diplomatische Aktenstücke zur Geschichte der Entente politik der Vorkriegsjahre, 1921.

A second volume will apparently complete M. Marchand's present task, and supply us with the rest of the archives at which he has been working, covering the whole period from November 1910, to July, 1914. The assistance of Professor Pokrovsky, Director of the Archives of the Foreign Office at Moscow, and of the whole staff of his department, is gratefully acknowledged.

There has been plenty of talk, and excellent talk too (we may heartily agree with M. Marchand), about the infamies of a certain secret diplomacy and of a certain imperialism, sinister varieties of an haute politique in which patriotism tends to be swallowed in chicanery, ambition, and greed, but few can have realised the extent of the influences we are combating, as here revealed. The editor himself, a journalist in constant touch with international affairs (*vivant à côté des ambassadeurs*), speaks with convincing force of the vague disquiet he experienced of old (as at the time of Delcassé's mission to Russia) on the rectitude of his country's policy. Yet, despite these moments of doubt, he quite accepted, in August, 1914, and even much later, the official doctrine of an innocent France brutally attacked by a ruthless enemy, who had long been planning her destruction. It was, then, with absolute stupefaction that on beginning his search in these confidential papers of the Russian Tsardom, he found in the first lines of manuscript such a revival of his worst fears and such an illumination of his darkest suspicions as he had fondly hoped could never happen.

And it is surely with no less stupefaction that many British folk, simple-hearted believers in a wicked Germany, a blameless France, a virtuous Russia, a peace-giving Entente, will read certain passages of this volume. They will read, for instance, how one of the principal French statesmen (*diplomate avisé et subtil, représentant achevé de l'école de Metternich, toujours avide d'intrigues de cour, de révolutions de palais, de conversations graves dans les baignoires d'opéra*) expressed his exultation at the outbreak of-war on the western front: "Excellentes, excellentes: Le

Luxembourg est envahie: jamais conditions n'ont été meilleures" (page xvi). They will also read how, by December 22, 1912, the Anglo-French Military Convention was as formal and complete an undertaking (à un caractère achevé et complet) as the Franco-Russian Alliance (page 367). They will discover how Lord Haldane's visit to Germany (in February, 1912) produced a suggestion from the German side that Britain should be neutral in case of a war involving Germany, but not provoked by Germany, and how this proposition was submitted to M. Poincaré, who denounced it in set terms (de la façon la plus catégorique, page 365). And they will find how by the Franco-Russian Convention (among other things many and tragic), the armed co-operation of the two Powers would be revealed directly a military intervention of Germany (in Balkan affairs) had become a fact (page 362). They may reflect also how opinion in the best informed circles of Paris was confident (at the end of 1912) that an irresistible current of events would force the British Government into hostile action against Germany (page 368). Lastly they will find recorded how France looked forward to such a cataclysm with a good heart (avec conscience et sang-froid) determined, though so "profoundly pacific", to fulfil all the obligations of the Russian Alliance — de remplir de la façon la plus loyale les obligations d'alliance (page 364, 369). The French Government, to this end, had taken the necessary measures: mobilisation on the Eastern frontier, the reparation of war material, and all else. For France had by this time no longer any fear of war being forced on her by her Allies, for interests not hers, but theirs: she only feared lest Russia might be too "passive" (que nous ne soyons trop passifs), in questions touching the prestige of the Entente as a whole (page 372).

---

### *The Treaty of Versailles.*

From the information given out by Marshall Foch and by representative Tardieu (in his book "La Paix" of 1921) one may see, that it was Clemenceau and Foch, who at the time of the armistice made the most crushing demands. Later-on the Parisian peacemakers killed all milder conditions proposed by their allies, wherever they could contrive to do so. It had been proposed, that France was to take over with Elsass-Lothringen her indebtedness and give a recompense for the public property, that unter German rule had reached a very high value. Her claim upon the mines in the Saar valley had been denied. Germany was to pay 40% of the war costs and after 30 years be free from all indemnities. She was to be allowed to unite with Austria and to be at once admitted to the League of Nations. Against these proposals Clemenceau raised decided objections and succeeded in having them set aside.

***Different  
points of  
view.***

In his "Proposals for the Peace Conference" contained in his memorial of May 22, 1917, Lloyd George declared that no Germans should be placed under the dominion of other nations if it could possibly be avoided, and he considered it very important not to separate areas of a German speaking population from the mother country, more important, all strategical than economic and financial arrangements. The responsible German government in accepting the Peace Treaty was to feel sure that it could meet its obligations. He furthermore declared: "Injustice, arrogance, displayed in the hour of triumph, will never be forgotten or forgiven. For these reasons I am, therefore, strongly averse to transferring more Germans from German rule to the rule of some other nation than can possibly be helped. I cannot conceive any greater cause of future war than that the German people, who have certainly proved themselves one of the most vigorous and powerful races in the world, should be surrounded by a number of small states, many of them consisting of people who have never previously set up a stable government for themselves, but each of them con-

taining large masses of Germans clamouring for reunion with their native land. The proposal of the Polish commission that we should place 2,100,000 Germans under the control of a people which is of a different religion and which has never proved its capacity for stable self government throughout its history, must, in my judgment, lead sooner or later to a new war in the East of Europe."

Lloyd George's wise admonitions were approved of in principle by Clemenceau, but politely rejected. Clemenceau declared that it was not the dismemberment of Germany that would keep the revanche spirit alive among the Germans but the loss of her position as a world power, the giving up of her colonies, her navy and merchant marine, her cables and foreign markets. Clemenceau declared he would certainly give his fullest support to the middle European nations (Czechs, Poles and Serbians) instead of strengthening Germany at their expense, thereby compensating her for the colonial, naval and commercial collapse which Peace would bring to Germany.

The military Peace Commission intended that Germany was to be permitted to maintain an army of 200,000 men who were to receive a one-year training. The Parisian potentates, however, pretended to be afraid that Germany would in this way be enabled within ten years to give a million men of her population a military training. They succeeded in abolishing conscription entirely in Germany, allowing her but an army of 100,000 professional soldiers, while the countries surrounding Germany, however, retained the conscription system.

Lloyd George was against the military occupation of the Rhinelands. He furthermore proposed that while France should be permitted to exploit the Saar mines for ten years, that the Saar district should meanwhile remain in German hands. But Clemenceau's policy of military subjection and despotism was adopted on every point!

This is what Lansing, the former American secretary of state says in his book on the Peace conference: "The



delegates were called together to listen, and not to be consulted or to make objections. Whatever their opinions might be, they had already expressed their consent by the form in which they had to register their name. It was a mediaeval rather than a modern, a despotic rather than a democratic procedure."

Clemenceau did, however, not get away with all his demands, and in September 1920 he pronounced the articles of the Versailles Treaty, "very defective", after he had already declared the year before, that: "the Treaty of Versailles is not a beginning, but only the beginning of a beginning." In his opinion, the ideas expressed in it might he exploited and elaborated upon. On May 19th, 1921, he said: "One could not destroy a people of 60.000.000, but one should try to make use of existing conditions. If, for example, the neighbours in the East should attack the Germans, one could refuse the latter the means of defence. Clemenceau likewise refused to pledge neutrality to disarmed Germany. When it was suggested, that the League of Nations had no military power, he declared that, even if it did have, he would refuse to mobilize a single French soldier to protect Germany against Bolshevism.

The Paris authorities seemed to think, that the articles of the Treaty of Versailles were sacred. They insisted upon stipulating the absolute and literal fulfilment of even the most intolerable and impossible decrees, because these offered ample opportunity to attack Germany at any time with threats and invasions.

From time to time Lloyd George made an attempt to prevent Paris from turning the Treaty of Versailles into an instrument of war against Germany. At the end of March 1920, he said: "Our first duty is, to see, that France receives "Fair play", but also to see to it, that she does not trample on Germany. Such a policy would be stupid . . . It would mean another war, from which heaven preserve us!"

According to the "Daily News" of October 30, 1920, Gardiner wrote: "France seethes with irreconcilable re-

venge against Germany. She insists upon the fulfilment of every item of the Treaty of Versailles, a treaty which the conscience of the whole world has cast aside, and in order to make her attitude more effective, she threatens with the occupation of the Ruhr district upon which the entire industrial life of Germany depends."

***The Question  
of  
Reparations.***

The Versailles Peace Treaty is a Treaty in name only. In reality it is a dictate of the enemies, no negotiations preceding in which the Germans were allowed to take part. The Versailles dictations are ambiguous and vague, they burden the German people with unlimited obligations and leave them but scant rights. And yet the French are not satisfied, they endeavor to obtain "new guarantees" against the alleged German Peril. The Paris politicians claim, that the Peace dictations have been deplorably weakened by their feeble application, that otherwise "they would have permitted the permanent occupation of the Rhinelands by the French."

Thru French influence the Peace Dictations were interpreted in such a way, that the French could continually use new threats, practice new extortions and make more and more far reaching demands on Germany in order to reach their final aim: The permanent occupation of the Rhineland as well as of the Ruhr district and furthermore, with Polish and Czech aid, the disruption of Germany.

Clemenceau interpreted the Versailles Dictations as a continuation of the war against Germany and according to the Paris "Humanité" of September 1919, he told the French officers: "Do not worry about your military future! The peace which we have concluded makes provision for at least ten years of Middle European conflicts". Nitti says in his work on the Versailles Treaty that the French know but one aim: "Continuation of the war in one form or another and sabotage of the defeated countries."

We have since experienced that the French play the leading part in most of those Foreign commissions, which pry into all German industries and have caused everything

to be destroyed, that might by the remotest chance be put to any possible use in military ways. Millions of marks worth of material has thus been wrecked, even such material as the small army which Germany is permitted to maintain stands in need of. The management of the "Deutsche Werke", — just to quote one instance, — paid alone 37 million marks for the destruction of its buildings, of those even, which previously, with the consent of the foreign commission, had been rebuilt and adapted to industrial purposes.

Wanton destruction and wastefulness, humiliation and insults are the means, which the French employ to restore "normal relations". In the occupied territory the war is continued quite openly.

When the three peace-makers Wilson, Lloyd George and Clemenceau were discussing the indemnities at Paris, Clemenceau demanded the colossal sum of 480 milliards of gold marks (see Thomas Lamont, economic adviser of the American contingent at the Peace conference, author of the book: "What really happened in Paris"). In vain the American contingent insisted upon the sum of 120 milliards of gold marks as the maximum. After Clemenceau and Lloyd George had declared, that any sum would be far less than what they had promised before the elections in their respective countries and that they would be driven out of office, it was decided not to name a definite sum.

In attempting to carry out the Treaty of Versailles, the German government has paid in cash within two years the enormous sum of 305 milliards of paper marks!

In estimating the damages, prodigious sums were submitted by the enemy. According to Professor Keynes, the French and Belgian demands were wildly exaggerated ones. According to German calculation the war damages in the occupied region of Northern France amounted to 7½ milliards of francs. According to French calculation they amounted at first to 62 milliards and later rose to the monstrous sum of 143 milliards of francs. One of the nouveaux riches, Minister Loucheur, estimated the whole

of the Saar mines at only 100 million gold marks as against the sum of 12 milliards (1 milliard is equal to 1000 million gold marks), for losses sustained in the partly damaged coal mines of the northern province!!

The guiding principle of the Paris conferences, was to keep Germany under constant pressure and by political and military means force her to make the highest possible payments. Germany was to be bled white. Leon Daudet, the confidant of Clemenceau, wrote: "The lucky event of the November revolution of 1918 must be exploited and the German pig must be prevented from getting on its feet again now, that we have it secure on the slaughtering bench." If Germany should go bankrupt, then, as the Minister of Finance, Doumer, said in the French Chamber on November 17th 1921, conditions would follow, which would surely break up the troublesome unity of the German Nation.

France is having her way and the unthinking among us are baffled by the yielding disposition on the part of England. So before closing this chapter I will quote another passage from a speech delivered by E. D. Morel at Dundee in May 1922:

"The explanation is perfectly simple. The men and interests in Britain and France that were bent upon a peace of violence upon the beaten foe, marched together up to a point. They marched together in so far as they both entertained the wild illusion they could make Germany pay the costs of the war. But thenceforth they diverged and took separate and antagonistic roads. The British imperialists wished to destroy Germany as a trade rival overseas, and as a colonial power. The French imperialists had no objection provided they were left free to destroy Germany in Europe. It was here that the future conflict became inevitable for it was not, and it is not, a British interest that Germany be destroyed. Mr. Lloyd George had glimmerings from the first of the consequences which the French imperialistic policy would have upon British industries and British strategy, hence his famous memo-

random. But having satisfied his own supporters, having secured his own return to power, having wiped out German overseas trade, seized German shipping, appropriated the German colonies, expelled German merchants from our tropical colonies and expropriated them — to the great damage of those colonies be it said incidentally — having done this, he could not oppose the irresistible logic of Clemenceau's reply to his plea for a reasonable policy towards Germany in Europe. "You have carried out your policy" said Clemenceau in effect. "You have satisfied your supporters. Now I am going to carry out my policy and satisfy my supporters!"

What have you got to say?

Mr. Lloyd George had nothing to say. Ever since he has been tied, and his country with him, to the cartwheels of French imperialist policy, dragged after it more unwillingly as he has appreciated more and more clearly the disastrous consequences upon the industrial life of Britain, to say nothing of other national interests which do not bulk so large at the moment, but will do so ere long; but unable to extricate himself from the impossible position into which his own acts have placed him, the French jerking violently at the rope whenever he has shown signs of resistance and, logically enough from their point of view, cursing him the while for an intriguer — a humiliating and increasingly dangerous position for our country."

We are supporting to today an army of occupation in the Rhinelands, which costs us more than the sum total of the entire budget of the Reich. Nobody knows this better than the French. Signor F. Nitti, former Italian Prime Minister expresses himself as follows on this and other aspects of the Question of Reparations:

"The hostility with which every suggestion of making loans to European countries is regarded in the United States, is not only justified but laudable. To loan money to the victorious countries on the European continent is tantamount to maintaining and accentuating the state of

disorder which is hastening the decline of Europe. With few exceptions all these countries have larger armies than before the war. The vanquished foe is without arms but there are victors who threaten and prepare for war, especially some of the smaller conquerors who owe their rise less to their own merits than to their good luck. If the U. S. loaned money to the victorious countries, she would encourage their policy. But if she loaned money to the defeated countries to enable them to pay preposterous and incredible reparations which the Treaty of Versailles imposes upon them, she would follow a still more disastrous course, because then the equivocal state of affairs and the harm it is doing would be protected. In my recently published book on European conditions I have proven irrefutably that the defeated nations cannot pay the reparations with which they have been burdened and that these reparations were imposed in a spirit of studied ambiguity and contrary to the avowed Entente principles and to Wilson's 14 points which should have formed the very basis of the peace concluded. I have proven furthermore that the reparations were not imposed so much with a view to securing an economic advantage but to strangle Germany, to humble her under the yoke of unbearable Allied Control and finally cause her to succumb under the weight of burdens which exceed her strength. In other words, the Paris Peace makers did not strive — at least not exclusively — after advantages for the victor but after the total ruin of the vanquished.

As long as the reparations have not been reconsidered and based on common sense and fairness, as long as the main resources of the German people must serve to maintain an Allied army of occupation which costs more than the largest armies and navies before the war, the United States by granting loans would support an evil policy that is ruining Europe and endangers the prosperity of America."

---

*„Noble and Peace-Loving France“*

in the Light of German History.

When at the end of January 1922 the negotiations of the Anglo-French alliance came to a standstill, the liberal London "Daily Chronicle" characterised French militarism as follows: "France looks upon Europe as a big military machine the task of which is to encircle Germany permanently with an iron ring. At the disarmament conference at Washington the French delegate Noblesse assured the world, that "noble, peace-loving, virtuous France" would willingly disarm, if it were possible for her to do so, but France being the Soldier of Civilization and Liberty must remain armed on account of Germany!" — What did the French mean by "Civilization and Liberty?" Answer: The continuation of the French war against Germany and the predominance of France on the European continent. — In October 1921, shortly before his departure to the United States, Foch declared: "I am going to tell the Americans that the peace, which we concluded, was not what it ought to have been and that America therefore should not be surprised, to see the war continued." For some reason, he considered it wiser not to confide his ideas on this subject to the American people, while he was touring the States.

French Militarism holds that it has not reaped "the fruits of the victories of her matchless armies," and that the fulness of "Gloire" could easily be obtained now, that Germany is completely disarmed. Fresh laurels beckon and French heroism is simply itching to march into defenceless Germany. Fortunately the Allies are putting a restraining hand on this martial fervor.

According to "Universal Service" of November 1921, Lloyd George warned Foch, to "consider well his policy, before driving Europe into another war, because this time he would be alone".

"We do not wish war" answered Foch, "but we are not afraid to be alone. At this moment the French army is

so powerful, that it could sweep victoriously over the whole of Europe.”

***Traditional  
French aims***

If the French army really is powerful enough, that it can sweep victoriously over the whole of Europe, then the French leaders have reached that aim, which Louis XIV and Napoleon I were striving after, viz. to hold despotic sway over the whole of Europe. Briand, anticipating such a success, declared in the French Chamber on February 27th 1921: “France must play the leading part in the world!” Here we have the real French “Soldiers of Civilization and Liberty” and they do not by any means fight for human rights, for liberty or for the self determination of peoples, but reveal instead the megalomania of their imperialistic French ancestors.

When after the French Revolution, the First French Republic started her marauding expeditions with protestations of her desire to liberate all oppressed nations, she forthwith annexed the border lands left of the Rhine. On October 1st 1798, the Paris National Assembly declared the Rhine to be the frontier of the French Republic and the entire territory on the left bank of the Rhine as for ever belonging to France. It happened to remain in French hands until 1813.

Today the French pretend to look upon Rhineland as “the lost inheritance of the French Revolution” which is needed to form what Richelieu called: “The rounding out of the French possessions.” Clemenceau, Foch and Poincaré are all of this persuasion and Briand wrote to the French ambassador in London as early as January 12th 1917, that “the Rhine was to be the French frontier”.

At the end of the world war the people of the Rhineland were given to understand, that all the vile calumnies propagated by politicians and savants thru the French Press were not meant for the Rhinelanders, because, according to a sudden discovery, they did not belong to the German but to the . . . Celtic race.



It was nevertheless deemed wise to make the population of the unhappy districts realize the "superiority" of French culture and to make the customs and culture of our beautiful Rhine Province appear base and contemptible. In the first place they resorted to the old trick of French democracy of indulging in abusive language, samples of which are the calling of the defenceless enemy "dirty German cattle" and comparing the German speech to the "howling of wild beasts". Such vulgarity has become familiar to us thru the enemy propaganda. The French also considered a daily dose of parading as a means to excite admiration for their greatness. To soberminded people this must appear ridiculous, to say the least, but the French are proudly unconscious of any ridicule. In the May issue of 1921 the "*Republique Française*" of Paris, to be sure, sharply criticized the theatrical get-up of the army of occupation, with its eternal trumpeting and parading intended to impress "the conquered people with French glory". But the strutting goes on in spite of civilian criticism — for it is and always will be truly French.

Considering the circumstances, it seems amazing that they should attempt to fan an imaginary hatred among the "celtic" inhabitants of the Rhinelands against their "Germanic" fellow citizens in organising gratuitous excursion trips thru the devastated regions in Northern France. One of the citizens approached, declined the invitation, saying, that in as much as the trip was meant to prove that war is destructive, there was no need for him to join the expedition because as a native of Heidelberg he had always had before him the sight of the castle of Heidelberg, wantonly destroyed by the French.

The Germans have certainly failed before the war to combat in foreign countries French propaganda in behalf of their alleged claims on Elsass-Lothringen. The world war has shown that modern Commercialism and Imperialism have no interest in the real facts other than to suppress them if they prove to be obstacles. German strength was derived from the search after truth (science) and in using the results

of some of this research work in the fields of industry and education. Strangely enough, it never occurred to German intellectuals and scholarly leaders, even in view of all that was going on about us, that there was a science of moulding Public Opinion at home and abroad. Nor do they apply their minds to it now and flatly refuse to follow the sensational methods of French, American and English newspapers. We are therefore still more or less doomed to rely on TRUTH to assert itself unaided.

***French  
Invasions of  
Germany.***

The following article taken from a recent issue of the "European Press" may serve to show what false ideas about France have, thru our lack of vision, taken hold of even the most cultured people in America:

"Mr. Vanderlip, the wellknown American financial expert has written an article published in various American papers as well in the "Vossische Zeitung" in which he describes the growing difference of opinion between France and Great Britain. He says that France's present fear of Germany is absolutely unfounded, but he tries to explain this fear by the fact that France "has always had a good deal to suffer from her unruly neighbour, who had attacked her twice in the course of the last century". He thus expresses a view which has wide currency. It cannot be denied that in the last two wars of 1870/71 and 1914/18, France was the theatre of war and had to bear the brunt of the battle. But it would be wrong to say that in the long run France has suffered more from German war activities than Germany from French devastations on German soil.

Whoever makes a journey through Western and Central Germany, to the Rhine, to the Moselle, to the Main, to the Neckar, — is everywhere shown the ruins of old castles destroyed by the French. Dividing the epoch from the entry of the French into the Thirty Years War to the present into two periods, the first, numbering 180 years, witnessed no less than 80 campaigns conducted on German soil by the French.

Let us give a short review of these campaigns. In 1634

the Thirty Years war (1616—1648), having already lasted 16 years, gave signs of an approaching end. The Catholic and Protestant parties in Germany had found out, that their forces were about equal and on both sides there was a great longing for peace. Then followed another 14 years of war and it was these which turned Germany into a desert, reducing her population from 18 to 5 millions. The last struggle was a struggle against the French in the heart of Germany.

The Westphalian Peace of 1648 destroyed the unity of the German Empire. France occupied bridge-heads on the Rhine and watched over German discord by setting her princes and prince-lets at loggerheads. Many of these were in French pay. During the reign of Louis XIV. which lasted 72 years, 33 years were devoted to wars against Germany. The first of these took place in Flanders (1667—68) which belonged to the empire up to a century ago. The second spread along the Rhine and through South-Germany (1672—79) when many districts were systematically destroyed. The third war, (1688—79) which to prevent the German princes made every effort, caused the inhuman destruction of the Palatinate. The ancient cities of Heidelberg, Manheim, Worms and Speyer were burnt down. Seventy other German towns and villages suffered the same fate. Even the fourth of the great wars conducted by Louis XIV took place in Western Germany (1700—1714) the chief sufferers being Bavaria, the Rhine and Flanders. Strassburg was taken during the interval between the second and third wars.

Under the reign of Louis XV., who occupied the throne for seventy years, Germany was likewise invaded by the French. The Polish war of succession (1734—36) was mainly fought on the Neckar and made Germany lose Lothringen. The Austrian war of succession (1741—48) caused French troops to spread over South Germany as far as Austria. During the Seven Years War (1756—63) the French penetrated into Northern Germany where they occupied Hannover and Hesse. The last act of this war was the retaking of Cassel by the Germans.

Everyone knows how much Germany had to suffer from the French Revolution and from the Napoleonic Wars. These wars lasted for twenty years without interruption. The frontier of the French Empire extended to Bremen, Hamburg and Lübeck. A milliard of gold francs was squeezed out of Silesia, Brandenburg and East-Prussia; a tremendous sum in those times. The biggest battle mankind had ever seen, the Battle of the Nations at Leipzig, was also fought on German soil.

When the Allies had succeeded in defeating France, she had to return part of the German-speaking provinces, but she kept Elsass and only paid an indemnity of 267 million francs, this being the reduced amount of an indemnity originally fixed at 800 millions. This happened at the Congress of Aachen.”

Thus an impartial observer must admit, that in the course of centuries Germany has had to suffer more from France than the other way about. If, therefore, foreigners imagine that the French must take precautions against an unruly neighbour, they are laboring under a false impression. When, however, the French, who know their own history, say so, it is a down-right lie.

***The Question  
of Elsass-  
Lothringen.***

When in 1750 the mayor of Strassburg learned that Marie Antoinette would pass through that city on her way from Vienna to Paris, he asked the University to name a Professor who could talk French well enough to address the future French Queen. It seems that none could be found — for the mayor himself delivered the address in German. (Krug-Basse, *L'Alsace avant 1789*, Paris 1877). Mark that the “lost province” had then been in French hands for two generations. — The young Goethe wrote that he heard nothing but German in Strassburg. Only since 1840 was the teaching of French introduced into the Public Schools, while up to that time the language had hardly been taught in any Elsassian schools. The “Elsassian Volksfreund” of 1867 writes: “German is our mother tongue. Our ancestors for many centuries spoke

German. Our customs and our way of thinking are German. Our first Lords Prayer we said in German". Monsieur Duruy, the French minister of Instruction stated in 1869, a year before the Franco-Prussian war, that it would be impossible to destroy the German language in the Elsaß.

After Elsaß-Lothringen had been reunited to Germany in 1871, Adolf Steeber, a protestant clergyman at Mühlhausen, collector of Elsassian legends addressed the Elsassian Francophile ligue:

"Nicht länger sollt Ihr unser Volk verwälschen,  
Wir sind der alten Mutter Söhn' aufs neue,  
Ihr schwören wir nicht Hass, nein Treue!"

When the French entered in 1918 into what they call "their lost provinces" they were surprised that very few Elsassians understood French at all. Even the Commissioner General Mr. Millerând of Elsass-Lothringen, later president of the Republic, told a reporter of the Paris "Journal" on August 2, 1920: "One may safely say that 75% of the urban and 95% of the rural population do not understand a word of French. The French, nevertheless, had sacrificed two million francs to create those "shouts of rejoicing" that were to reveal to all the world "the boundless joy of the population." They soon found out, however, that the few Elsassian francophiles and hired prewar agitators, represented but a very small part of the 2 million Elsassians and that the others looked aghast at the French despots and at their innovations. French became at once the official and only language for instruction in all Public Schools. This measure, of course, aroused the ire of the Elsassians. The "Elsässische Kurier" says that the wisdom imported from France in the form of French instructors is quite wasted on the Elsassians, because the pupils do not know French nor the teachers German.

The general public in English speaking countries has accepted as truth all the French nonsense about Elsass-Lothringen published in the newspapers. The Elsassians

have been German in race, language and customs for over a thousand years. They do certainly not wish to be French! Why should they? As to the silly claim of French superiority in culture let me quote Deputé de Wendel of Metz in Lothringen who says in the Metz "Messin" of July 1921: "Our provinces have passed thru 50 years of order and prosperity." Paul Reboux says in his book "The only way" (Paris 1922): "The Elsass has progressed a great deal more in its general culture than the neighboring French departments." If they admit it themselves, it must certainly be true!

---

### *French militarism.*

The French, English, American and Belgian forces of occupation were originally not to exceed the numerical strength of the garrisons that Germany used to maintain in the Rhinelands in normal times, **whereas the French forces** alone numbered 120.000 men towards the end of 1920.

An American, who for 14 months was in charge of the Entente Rhineland commission, Mr. Pierrepont B. Noyes, says in his book: "While Europe is waiting for Peace" (1922): "The military occupation of the Rhinelands under French command is brutal, provoking, a continuation of the war. To keep up this hostile occupation of the Rhinelands for 15 years as a sort of agency to collect the German debt, is unthinkable, it would be a rankling sore. Every sensible person would curse such a hate and murder breeding institution. I could give details that would make every American stare with horror, but I will leave it to the imagination of my readers, to decide what the final result would be of fifteen years occupation of the New England States by victorious colored troops."

At the end of 1921 some 227.000 soldiers of the standing French army were colored and the colored troops are to be brought up to the strength of 300.000 men. Not only does France draw on her own colonies, but she is also drafting the men from among the male population of our own African colonies. According to article 22 of the Versailles Dictates it is forbidden to give the African natives a military training. No member of the League of Nations, however, ventures to call attention to this French violation of the Treaty.

***The colored  
troops***

More than 30.000 colored Frenchmen were stationed in the Rhineland towards the end of 1921. The French rejoice in humiliating the Germans by stationing African negroes over them as their superiors. The German police force has to stand at attention when the sons of Africa march by. Those who live in the south of the U.S.A. are familiar with the outrages committed by these primitive people. And what Americans think of them, is clearly expressed by Mr. Lisson, who Jan. 26. 22. declared in Congress: "I regret lynching but as long as the black devils place their hands on white women, they must be lynched!" And these American negroes have for centuries lived under the restraining influence of Anglo-Saxon civilisation. What the unbridled passion of negroes, taken fresh from the African wilds, means when there is no restraining influence, may easily be imagined. But it can scarcely be produced in all its horror what it is when official encouragement is given to humble the "dirty boches" and ample leisure and money is to be had as well as the exciting example of the white Frenchmen.

In the "African World" of October 29th 1921, Captain E. A. Bagley, member of the house of Commons, asks: "What will happen when these semibarbarians return and tell of their lording it over whites and the wives of these? What but the position of master heretofore protected the handful of Europeans and their families who lived among the negroes?" He demands that the statesmen of a world empire under whose flag live more colored people

than whites, should see to it that France withdraws the colored troops from the Rhine. In deference to the French, however, the British, have done nothing of the sort. Captain Bagley therefore warns them that long after the withdrawal of the army of occupation the witness of this terrible condition of horror and shame will call for revenging it on the nation responsible for it. Under the pretext of humbling Germany in a military sense, he says, France has lacerated the soul of the German people. According to latest reports the French people have espoused the cause of the negroes to such a degree, that they publicly denounced the Americans for denying the negroes social equality in the United States.

***The Rhineland  
as a French  
military  
base.***

Two thirds out of a total of 4500 acres of highly cultivated land which has been confiscated for military purposes by the Entente commissions is being used by the French. Recently the latter demanded 6000 more acres, this time near the Elsassian fortress of Bitsch on which land the German government is to put up some 190 buildings as well as to construct some 10 miles of railroad. The Belgians followed suit and demanded four more training camps at Moers, Hochemmerich, Buederich and Issum. No special penetration is needed to see that such demands are quite beyond any justified aims of the army of occupation; it is evident that France and her Belgian satellite play a game of extortion to make Germany pay for a vast enlargement of the French military machine on her own soil. Aside from this, the French never miss a chance to torment the cheerful Rhinelanders. They, for instance, confiscate German schools for the use of their African soldiers, rather than use the barracks which were good enough for the former German garrisons. At Wiesbaden they took 7 out of the 17 school buildings and at Düsseldorf one fifth of all the school buildings . . . The civil population has no rights left. Any apartment that strikes the fancy of the French must be vacated and, the people that occupied it may consider themselves lucky if they are permitted to take up quarters in the basement or in the garret. Sometimes



the furniture does not seem elaborate enough or silverware and china are pronounced unsatisfactory and then it has to be replaced by new and more costly things. In this way a single French family recently cost the German government nearly a million marks.

The conduct more especially of the French army of occupation certainly impresses all decent minded Rhinelanders as contemptible and repulsive. The orgies which its white and black members celebrate at the expense of a suffering population are on a level with the base and despicable means employed daily to torture the people by means of petty orders, greedy extortions overbearing behavior. "Let us impress it on the boches that we really and truly are the victors," the pompous conquerors seem to express in their every action.

The clumsy attempts of the French to make moral conquests in the occupied territory are, of course, but a camouflage behind which they practise plunder, extortion and corruption.

Tardieu calls the Saar question in his book: "La Paix" (Paris 1921) "the only one, which for ten days caused a disagreement between the representatives of the United States and France, a disagreement, which almost led to a break".

***France  
and the Saar  
district.***

When Clemenceau demanded the Saar district for France, he met with strong opposition. Lloyd George was against annexation and said: "We do not wish to create another Alsace-Lorraine." Wilson also objected. Then Clemenceau arose and said: "There are in the Saar district some 150.000 people, who are French. These people, who sent addresses to Poincaré in 1916 must be justly dealt with. You wish to respect the rights of the Germans, so do I. But you must also bear in mind the rights of the French." Clemenceau knew quite well, that there were not 100 Frenchmen among the 600.000 population of the Saar district. Again in his note of May 26, 1919, Clemenceau made similar

statements quite contrary to truth. This was even admitted in the summer of 1921 by Major Richet, manager of French propaganda in the Saar district.

Meanwhile, a French military force, numbering 8000 soldiers, two thirds of which were colored, held sway in the Saarland and bestowed the blessings of French Culture on the peaceful and industrious population. When the citizens cried out against robberies, rape and general misbehavior of the troops, the French military courts rejected their complaints but meted out severe punishment to the Saar people in cases of even the slightest resistance against French authority. According to the Versailles Treaty, only a local police was to be provided for the maintenance of public order. For fully two years the League of Nations permitted the French to violate the Versailles Treaty on this point and even when early in 1922 the League recommended the withdrawal of the French troops, the French began to call back merely their colored troops, whose records were unspeakable outrages. It is evident, that a peaceful penetration of the country is by no means a number on the French program of occupation. The French rule with a high hand and hope, that by exiling the German leaders, by establishing French schools, by suppressing German influence, by making the importation of German books and periodicals difficult, by intimidating and corrupting the population systematically, they can turn these thoroughly German people into loyal Frenchmen!

In 1921 Briand complimented himself in saying: "The Saar district is very much satisfied with our liberal administration!" He must have referred to the reports of Parisian adventurers, French officials, cocottes and similar additions to the Saar population, who actually may be satisfied with "this liberal administration". The genuine inhabitants of the district are certainly not of this turn of mind. That such a fraud should be committed in the name of "self determination of peoples" speaks volumes. Occasionally a courageous Entente politician expresses his dissatisfaction with this state of affairs, as for instance Ben Spoor last year in

the House of Commons: "Our allies not only constantly create unnecessary and useless irritations, which make a consolidation of the economic life of the Saar-district impossible, but they likewise create a state of mind among the population, which must lead to a new European war, if nothing is done to correct it. The gist of the whole matter is, that the French do not interpret the Treaty honestly."

Milliards of French money roll eastward annually to create a powerful Poland and while this unhappy country is thus encouraged in a policy of imperialism, its economic resources pass rapidly into the hands of French capitalists.

***France,  
Poland and  
Upper Silesia.***

In February 1922 France and Poland ratified the various agreements. In the military agreement Poland pledges herself to maintain a standing army of 600.000 men and France to pay 600.000 francs daily to defray the cost of this enormous military force which had been drilled for some years past by about one thousand French officers, the entire military equipment having been supplied by France. According to "Ere Nouvelle", Poland, during the spring of 1920 received the following: 327.000 rifles, 2800 machine guns, 48.000 revolvers, 1500 canons, 24.000 horses as well as flying machines and automobiles in great quantities. In the French budget a milliard of francs was provided for this purpose. According to French plans, to check the "terrible menace" of a completely disarmed Germany, a substantial part of the milliards of gold marks which Alibaba-Germany is supposed to produce by strokes of magic, will be used to vastly increase the military armaments of France and her satellites.

Incendiarism and Polish insurrections in Silesia were openly encouraged and organised with the connivance of the French, and altho their troops dealt brutally and ruthlessly with the population in order to intimidate the German vote, the plebiscite showed an overwhelming German majority. No greater farce than this voting, for in spite of this majority, important sections of Silesian industrial and mining districts were given to Poland!!

For 750 years Upper Silesia belonged to the German Empire and flourished later under Prussian administration. At the request of an American banking firm Mr. Sidney Osborne personally investigated Silesian economic conditions in 1919 and reported the results of his inquiry in his book "The Upper Silesian Question and Germany's Coal Problem", London 1921: "Upper Silesia owes its prosperity and its culture to the Germans and especially to the Prussian administration since Frederic the Great. Its future growth depends on its belonging to Germany."

Up to recently the Poles had shown no special interest in Upper Silesia since they already possessed large coal fields themselves. The Paris "Temps" admitted on August 15th 1921 that Polish covetousness awakened when the French suggested that the Poles might be used as sentinels against Germany. The plan was to weaken Germany thru the separation of Upper Silesia and on the other hand to strengthen Poland by adding Upper Silesia to its territory. This intention was supported by the Polish foreign minister Prince Sapieha in the "Temps" of February 5, 1921, with the contention that Upper Silesia would be a splendid base for the Polish army which could be made to equal the French in strength. When those two armies were keeping the watch in the East and West, the European Peace would be secure!

When in February 1921 Pilsudski discussed an alliance treaty de French pledged themselves to do everything in their power and especially to induce Lloyd George to extend his aid in pushing Upper Silesia to the Poles. The French on the other hand demanded large compensations. At first they wished to oblige Poland to pay a corresponding share of the milliards of francs that France had advanced to tsaristic Russia, so that the Russians might prepare themselves properly for the French "revanche war". But when the French realised that no cash was obtainable from the Poles, they forced the latter to transfer to the influential industrial group of Schneider-Creusot the exploitation of the large ceded coal mines and founderies, aside from other valuable privileges which they secured.

The French connived at and encouraged every crime and excess committed by the Poles against the German civil population. It was hoped that by official or semi-official terrorism, intimidation and corruption a Polish majority might be obtained in the plebiscite that was to take place on March 21, 1921. In spite of all these manipulations there were, however, 716,000 votes in favor of Germany and 471,000 votes in favor of Poland. In November 1920, Mrs. Dorothy F. Buxton, the wife of a member of the House of Commons published in "Common Sense" the impressions gained during her personal investigations of Silesian conditions: "The French cooperate with the Poles in such a way that whoever shows his loyalty to Germany is liable to be set upon, plundered and shot. There is no protection and indemnity for the families of these victims!"

The French promptly expelled Mrs. Buxton from Silesia!

The French alliance with Poland, is not, however, considered sufficient protection. Other countries such as Rumania, Serbia and Czechoslovakia have concluded secret Treaties with France and are building up military organisations in order to prepare themselves for the task which France has set them. The French policy in eastern Europe is criticised by the London "Daily News" of Oct. 18th, as follows: "From one end of Europe to the other, the French Statesmen are following a policy of aggression and of military and economic penetration. In order to keep down the German people they have established on the entire continent a system of vassal states, favored, armed, financed and led by France. "The military peace strength of these nations combined with that of France is about 2 Million men as against the one hundred thousand soldiers that Germany is allowed to have".

***Crippled  
Germany  
and „Noble  
Peace-loving  
France“.***

It will be useful to repeat here the figures quoted by the late Dr. Rathenau in his speech delivered in the Reichstag in April 1922:

"It is often asserted, that Germany has not disarmed and won't disarm, while in fact the disarmament of Germany embraces the mightiest army reduction that has ever taken place, it embraces the loss of our fortresses! In addition to that the following arms have been delivered up: 5,8 million rifles and carabines, 102.000 machine guns, 28.000 mine and bombthrowers, 53.000 cannon, 40 million hand granades and other bombs, 56 million fuzes, 93 million rifle cartridges and 31.900.000 powder charges. In view of these facts it is presumptuous to assert, that Germany has done nothing towards disarmament. German disarmament is an achievement without parallel. The finding here and there of a few weapons in Germany cannot materially alter this fact. A hundred years hence one will look for hidden weapons in German soil, just as today one finds coins of Diolectian and the Lombards. If a fraction of one percent of weapons remain undelivered, that is no reason for exaggerating the fact under the title "discoveries", seeing they represent nothing further, than the remnant left after every big action. No man in his senses can maintain, that Germany could wage war with the arms, she has left. Germany's disarmament is complete, the more so, as it took place in a Europe bristling with armour.

The result of the projected disarmament of the world is, that there are now 4,7 million soldiers in Europe as compared with 3,7 millions before the war and with Germany's share in this number reduced to 100.000 men. In this world bristling with weapons, it is impossible, if one regards the conditions honestly, to speak of Germany as armed and ready for war.

Now let us investigate the other assertion often made by the French that Germany has not paid anything and does not intend to meet the obligations that are hers under the "Charter of Wrongs" as the Englishman Morel calls the

Versailles Traty. I quote once more from the same speech of Dr. Rathenau:

“German property liquidated abroad is worth 11,7 milliards; the surrendered fleet 5,7 milliards. The property of the German Republic in the ceded territories is worth 6.5 milliards. The surrendered railway and traffic rolling stock is worth 2 milliards in gold. Other contributions of a non military character amount to 5.8 milliards. The loss of Germany’s claims on her allies during the war amount to 7 milliards. The Saar mines are worth 1,1 milliards, the coal delivered up till now represents a sum of 1,3 milliards of marks, then there are further reparation contributions of 1,3 milliards of marks, making with a series of smaller sums 3,2 milliards. We thus reach a sum total of 45,6 milliards of gold marks as representing Germany’s payments since the end of the war. But this does not include the loss of West Prussian territory nor that of Upper Silesia. These bring the sum to far over 100 milliards of gold marks”.

Crippled Germany is attempting the impossible, viz, to fulfill the terms imposed upon her by the Versailles “*Charter of Wrongs, The Tool of International Robbery*”. The basis of this Versailles “*Charter of Wrongs*” viz. the sole guilt of German, has meanwhile been proven to be a myth. It seems incredible that the crusaders for Democracy, Justice, Liberty and Civilisation should follow “*Noble Peace-loving France*” and to encourage the exploitation of her ill-gotten gains as well as her criminal work of destruction.

And yet it is so! Lord Northcliffe, the friend of France, manager of anti-German propaganda, of “*Times*” and “*Daily Mail*” fame, recently came to live with us for a while. His sinister presence was, no doubt, calculated to lend weight to the lies and mis-representations of his papers to prove that crippled Germany is one of the wealthiest and most prosperous countries and fully able to atone for her criminal desire to live and to recover by paying the “*modest reparations*” asked by the Allies. Northcliffe’s visit was shortened by the significant fact that

he suddenly became violently insane. He died on Aug. 15, 1922 in a Swiss Insane Asylum.

It is with particular satisfaction therefore that I quote here passages of a report made by an American at the Conference of the Central Relief Committee at Chicago. Mr. Hennigson, one of its chief officers, just back from a trip to Germany during which he made a careful study of German conditions, has this to say about the results of his investigations:

“Want and misery are still in evidence everywhere in Germany, although foreign newspapermen deny it because they place their opinions on the alleged luxury and good living of Berlin people and fail to mention that their description of German life fits almost exclusively the doings of the foreigners who are crowding the German hotels and whose money has not lost in purchasing power like the German Mark. Whoever desires to can see at every step want and misery in Public Institutions as well as in individual families.

On visiting any of the German hospitals or Public Nurseries, for instance, one gets at first the impression that everything looks neat and tidy as if nothing were lacking; but upon inquiring after details, the facts leak out: first that the Institution can only be kept going with utmost difficulty and secondly that in many cases other similar Institutions, important to the welfare of the community, have been forced to close their doors after the last supply of linen and other material had been used up. Repairs and the purchase of new supplies is out of the question, for the capital of most of the otherwise admirably managed Institutions, modest even in times of Peace, has dwindled down to almost nothing thru the depreciation of the Mark. The closing of such Institutions, including even homes for the consumptive — mean an incalculable damage to Public Health not alone because patients who might be cured are now doomed to pine away but also because they are a constant danger of contagion to those about them. In a like manner numerous Public Nurseries, had to be closed down for want of means. In



normal times the mother who went out to work was comforted to know that her children were well taken care of during the day until she could call for them in the evening. Since these homes have been closed, the little ones have to remain at home, uncared for and without warm food, at best under the supervision of a bigger brother or sister when these return from school. No details are necessary to point out the harm that must result from this lack of proper care to the little ones as well as to the welfare of the community.

The same misery is noticeable in the German middle-class which suffers more from the ever decreasing purchasing power of the mark than the organised laborers, because their incomes kept pace in a much lesser degree with the constantly rising prices. In most families of the middle-classes neither linen nor clothing have been purchased since the war but the supply on hand has been turned and returned, or changed into some other garment until in one or two years more the entire supply will have disappeared and these middle-classes, once so sound economically, will face abject poverty. But the laborers as well suffer from want. If a laborer has four or more children, even his relatively high wages, aided by the greatest economy, do not suffice for the indispensable necessities of life. The lack of underwear is terrible, because the people simply cannot afford to pay the high prices which the manufacturers on their part are forced to ask on account of the cost of raw materials. The purchase of a pair of shoes means today to thousands of German families an unsolvable problem. The prevailing general distress makes itself felt the more when — as it happened last winter — an epidemic occurs. Want of clothing and food and undernourishment of long years standing have revealed on such occasions that an alarming decrease in the power of resistance has taken place in a people otherwise regarded as healthy and strong, but now weakened by undernourishment during long and weary years of war. It is pathetic to watch the terrible results which a long drawn out underfeeding process has produced on the physical and moral development of the German children!”

**France and the  
restoration  
of Europe**

Where will the madness of French militarism lead us? It triumphed at Versailles as well as at the recent conferences of Cannes, Genua, Paris, The Hague and London.

The Versailles Treaty destroys the possibility of European restoration and, strangely enough, this is the wish of France as much as to obtain fabulous reparations. Poincaré, whose part played in bringing on the world war has been revealed by the Soviet government, hopes that by brute force and aided by half a million African soldiers now in training, he can still attain his end and make France the most powerful nation of the world.

The Treaty of Versailles is a fraud and yet as Mr. Gardiner of London expresses it: "France seething with irreconcilable revenge insists upon the fulfilment of its every item, though the conscience of the whole world has cast it aside!"

France has never been on moral ground at any period of the war unless she considers her actions justified by the spirit of hatred and revenge which her leaders so persistently nursed. Protected by the Versailles "Charter of wrongs" she is setting out to destroy Germany economically and to defy her former allies.

Slowly bolshevism is creeping up from the East! The bolshevists want to liberate the world from the present capitalistic system of "sham democracy". Their success will depend upon the sovereign citizens of the democratic countries who fought us in the name of democracy. If the latter continue to support unscrupulous leaders who would make of the fair name of democracy a synonym of dishonesty, insincerity and all that is base in human nature, they have indeed fought us in the name of "sham democracy".

No longer can indifference be excused by catch-phrases! ACT AND HELP IN BRINGING ABOUT A REVISION OF THE TREATY OF VERSAILLES — BEFORE IT IS TOO LATE!

---

---

***This pamphlet has also  
been issued in French.***

---

# **TARTARIN ON THE RHINE**

BY

**ALLEMAND DAUDET**

**225 pages ill.**

**Price 50 cents**

„The author, a brilliant satirist and apparently very familiar with actual conditions in the Rhinelands tells his remarkable story about the French army of occupation with a sparkling wit that affords us many a laugh on our Ally“

**Obtainable at all bookstores or  
directly from the publishers**

---

***Overseas Publishing Company  
Hamburg 15, Germany***